



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,406	06/14/2000	Dirk Rosenau	P00,1187	8262

7590 08/28/2002

SCHIFF, HARDIN & WAITE
Patent Department
71st Floor Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER


ABDI, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/593,406	Applicant(s) ROSENAU ET AL. 	
	Examiner Kambiz Abdi	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3,5</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 have been examined.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed as European patent no. GE 199 28 058.4 published 6/15/1999.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 14 June 2000 are acceptable subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the attached "Notice of Draft person's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948. In order to avoid abandonment of this application, correction is required in reply to the Office action. The correction will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the applicant is reminded of inconsistency of terms used to describe the claimed invention. The examiner encourages that applicant to use the word "arrangement" all through the claims rather than "invention" in claim 1 and "arrangement" for the rest of the claims 2-8. Appropriate correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed on June 14, 2000, paper number 3, fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Art Unit: 3621

Specification

6. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet, within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title or to be confusing. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. The abstract exceeds the 150 words limitation and the language is not clear.

Additionally the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 6, line 8, it is not clear to the examiner as what tasks the applicant is speaking of in the following phrase "a microprocessor is provided in the meter for the tasks and".

Page 7, line 9, there are no precedent for the "security module SM".

Page 8, line 10, there is no "chip card 49" designation in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required. Applicant is advised to carefully review the entire specification for further needed corrections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3621

8. Claims 1 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,680,463 to Harald Windel and U.S. Patent No. 4,934,846 to Dennis T. Gilham in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,422 to Stephen Guenther.

As for claim 1 and 9, while both Windel and Gilham disclose; a franking system and method comprising;

a security module containing a first program memory in which a first program is stored and a security module data processing unit connected to said first program memory and being programmed by said first program to calculate a multi-byte security code from existing system data and to be able to receive new system data to modify said existing system data (See Gilham col. 1, ln. 47-68, col. 2, ln. 1-60, and Windel figure 1 and 10 and 10, col. 9, ln. 4-46);

said security module data processing unit being further programmed by said first program to, immediately upon receipt of said new system data, validate said new system data and determine whether said new system data are required for said security code and, if so, to immediately begin recalculating said security code in a first routine and, in a second routine, to finish recalculating said security code for at least one security imprint, thereby producing a recalculated security code, and to initiate an accounting operation for said monetary value and to communicate the recalculated security code to said separate data processing unit (See Gilham col. 1, ln. 47-68, col. 2, ln. 1-60, col. 4, ln. 1-33, and Windel figure 1 and 10, col. 9, ln. 4-46);

What Windel and Gilham do not explicitly discuss is the separate data processing unit for processing the franking imprint at the printing module. Both Windel and Gilham disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of second data processing at the print control module. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Windel and Gilham, to provide the step of a separate data processing unit disposed externally of said security module and having a second program memory in which a second program is stored, said separate data processing unit being programmed by said second program to edit print data to compile a print image that contains said security code as a security imprint and that embodies a monetary value for franking a mail item, since applicant has not disclosed that additional data processing solves any stated problem in a new or

Art Unit: 3621

unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Windel and Gilham will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any method, means, or product to print the franking a mail item. In addition, Guenther clearly discloses a secondary data processing external of the security module (Such as an smart card) carrying a value for franking a postal meter imprint (See Guenther figure 1a, 2, 4, and 5a). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a better authorization procedure and more reliable validation system for the postal franking systems.

As for claim 10, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 9, further;

Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of, calculating a data authorization code in said security module data processing unit as said security code dependent on said ascending register value and additional data in said new system data and generating said security imprint at a time following an end of entry of said new system data and before conducting an accounting for said monetary value. Therefore, It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Windel, Gilham, and Guenther, to provide the step of, using an ascending register in order to calculate an authorization code, since applicant has not disclosed that using ascending register solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Windel, Gilham, and Guenther will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any method, means, or product to use the ascending register as a variable for generating security code.

As for claim 11, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 9, further;

Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of, using a plurality of mail items all having the same monetary value for franking or different

Art Unit: 3621

authorization code based on plurality of variable numbers such as ascending or descending registers or change in the time or date or the article number. wherein said new system data are associated with an inserted mail item and wherein said security code is a data authorization code and wherein said security module data processing unit calculates said data authorization code dependent on said ascending register value and additional data in said new system data at a time from said insertion of said mail item and before conducting an accounting for said monetary value. However, Gilham clearly discloses the steps mentioned above for generating an authorization code for postal franking. (See Gilham col. 4, ln. 1-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for tracking and securing the postal franking systems. In addition, it would speed up the printing process by pre-processing some calculations based on none variable data needed to calculate the authorization code for printing by the postal franking system.

9. Claims 2-5 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,680,463 to Harald Windel, U.S. Patent No. 4,934,846 to Dennis T. Gilham and U.S. Patent No. 6,418,422 to Stephen Guenther, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view U.S. Patent No. 4,649,266 to Alton B. Eckert.

As for claim 2, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 1, further;

What Windel does not explicitly teach is that a security code is a data authorization code and wherein said security module data processing unit contains an internal non-volatile memory in which at least one key for calculating said data authorization code is protectively stored against access and wherein said security module contains a further security module data processing unit for performing said accounting. However, both Gilham and Eckert clearly teaches the method of creating a security code to be imprinted on the mail item and keeping an accounting of the available fund to the franking system by means of a data processing module. (See Gilham col. 3, ln. 57-68 and col. 4, ln. 1-33 and Eckert figures 1 and 2, and col. 1, ln. 66-68 and col. 2, ln. 1-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 3621

ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a more reliable and efficient processing system and method for tracking and securing the postal franking systems.

As for claim 3, Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 2, further;

wherein said security module data processing unit is a processor programmed by said first program to calculate a first eight bytes of said data authorization code in advance in said first routine each day, and wherein said further security module data processing unit is a hardware accounting unit which produces an accounting result as a result of said accounting in said second routine, and wherein said security module further contains a non-volatile memory, accessible by said hardware accounting unit, in which said hardware accounting unit stores said accounting result (See Gilham col. 4, ln. 1-34). However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine both teachings to expedite and create a more secure and better authorization code to be printed by a franking system.

As for claim 4, Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 3, further;

Windel and Gilham disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of, a processor is programmed by said first program to determine an ascending register value, dependent on said monetary value, for at least one mail item, and to finish calculating said data authorization code in said second routine for said at least one mail item using said ascending register value. Therefore, It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Windel and Gilham, to provide the step of, using an ascending register since applicant has not disclosed that using ascending register solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Windel and Gilham will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any method, means, or product to use the ascending register as a variable for generating security code.

Art Unit: 3621

As for claim 5, Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 3, further;

Windel and Gilham disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, but Gilham clearly discloses the step of, using a plurality of mail items all having the same monetary value for franking or different authorization code based on plurality of variable numbers such as ascending or descending registers or change in the time or date or the article number. Wherein said processor is programmed by said first program to pre-calculate a next-successive data authorization code for a next mail item after debiting said monetary value for a preceding mail item (See Gilham col. 4, ln. 1-34). However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine both teachings to speed up overall processing of information such as calculation of an authorization code to be printed by a franking system.

As for claim 12, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 9, further;

Windel, Gilham, and Guenther teach how an authorization code can be calculated and there is certain pre-calculations that do take place in their system. But, what they are not explicit is said security code is a data authorization code and wherein said security module data processing unit calculates said data authorization code dependent on a machine identifier, said monetary value and a current date, and wherein at least said machine identifier is included in a pre-calculation of n bytes of said data authorization code. However, Eckert clearly discloses the steps and process to obtain an authorization code based on the elements that have been mentioned above and certain pre-calculations that have been mentioned (See Eckert figures 1, 2, and 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve further strength in the cryptography of the validation code to be printed by the postal franking systems in addition to speed up overall processing of information such as calculation of an authorization code to be printed by a franking system. Preprocessing of certain calculations for speeding up further processing in a system is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 3621

As for claim 13, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 9, further;

Windel, Gilham, and Guenther teach how an authorization code can be calculated and there is certain pre-calculations that do take place in their system. But, what they are not explicit is said security code is a data authorization code and wherein said security module data processing unit calculates said data authorization code dependent on a machine identifier, said monetary value and a current date, and wherein at least said machine identifier and said date is included in a pre-calculation of n bytes of said data authorization code. However, Eckert clearly teaches a security module capable of creating an authorization code for postal franking that does pre-calculations of data before the next variable has arrived (See Eckert figures 1,2, and 3, and col. 2, ln. 1-68). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve further strength in the cryptography of the validation code to be printed by the postal franking systems in addition to speed up overall processing of information such as calculation of an authorization code to be printed by a franking system. Preprocessing of certain calculations for speeding up further processing in a system is well known in the art.

As for claim 14, Windel, Gilham, and Guenther disclose, all the limitations of claim 9, further;

Windel, Gilham, and Guenther teach how an authorization code can be calculated and there is certain pre-calculations that do take place in their system. But, what they are not explicit is comprising successively supplying sets of new system data to said security module data processing unit and after communicating said security code to said separate data processing unit, in said security module data processing unit beginning calculation of a next-successive security code for next new system data, at least dependent on said ascending register value to produce pre-calculated n bytes of said next-successive security code. However, Eckert clearly teaches a security module capable of creating an authorization code for postal franking that does pre-calculations of data before the next variable has arrived (See Eckert figures 1,2, and 3, and col. 2, ln. 1-68). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve further strength in the cryptography of the validation code in addition to speed up

Art Unit: 3621

overall processing of information, such as calculation of an authorization code to be printed by a franking system. Preprocessing of certain calculations for speeding up further processing in a system is well known in the art.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,680,463 to Harald Windel, U.S. Patent No. 4,934,846 to Dennis T. Gilham, U.S. Patent No. 6,418,422 to Stephen Guenther, and U.S. Patent No. 4,649,266 to Alton B. Eckert, as applied to claim 3 above and further in view U.S. Patent No. 5,671,146 to Harald Windel.

As for claim 6, Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 3, further;

Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of, internal non-volatile memory, which is an SRAM of said processor, and wherein said security module further comprises a battery supporting said SRAM, and wherein said SRAM had memory areas for protected storage of at least some data produced by said pre-calculation, and wherein said at least one key for calculating said data authorization code is protectively stored in a memory area of said SRAM.

Computer systems typically use magnetic disk drives for mass storage of data. However, disk drives are disadvantageous in that they are bulky and in their requirement for high precision moving mechanical parts. Consequently they are not rugged and are prone to reliability problems, as well as consuming significant amounts of power. Solid state memory devices such as DRAM's and SRAM's do not suffer from these disadvantages. However, they are much more expensive, and require constant power to maintain their memory (volatile). Consequently, they are typically used as temporary storage.

Cache memory is generally used to speed up the performance of systems having slower access devices. For example in a computer system, access of data from disk storage is slow and the speed would be greatly improved if the data could be obtained from the much faster RAM. Typically a part of system RAM is used as a cache for temporarily holding the most recently accessed data from disk. The next time the data is needed, it may be obtained from the fast cache instead of the slow disk. The

Art Unit: 3621

scheme works well in situations where the same data is repeatedly operated on. This is the case in most structures and programs since the computer tends to work within a small area of memory at a time in running a program. Another example of caching is the using of faster SRAM cache to speed up access of data normally stored in cheaper but slower DRAM or any other none volatile memory devices. In addition is has been used in the art for security reasons and tamper proofing remote systems that need to be securely placed and prevented from being accessed by unauthorized persons (See Windel (5,671,146) figures 1b, 1c, and 2A and col. 11, ln. 9-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve a faster, more reliable and more efficient processing system for the postal franking systems to access data stored in the memory and at the same time more secure housing for the franking device to be tampered with.

11. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,680,463 to Harald Windel, U.S. Patent No. 4,934,846 to Dennis T. Gilham, U.S. Patent No. 6,418,422 to Stephen Guenther, U.S. Patent No. 4,649,266 to Alton B. Eckert, and U.S. Patent No. 5,671,146 to Harald Windel as applied to claim 6 above and further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,058,193 to Robert A. Cordery.

As for claim 7, Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 6, further;

What Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert are not specific and explicit about is a processor is programmed by said first program to calculate said data authorization code using a machine identifier and OCR key indicator, a date, said monetary value, and a register value for an ascending register. However, Cordery clearly discloses using OCR recognizable characters and the usefulness of OCR Key indicators (or error correction code) (See Cordery figures 6 and 7 and col. 9, ln.43-47) for additional indicium's for generating a validation markings or authorization code. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the

Art Unit: 3621

above teachings to achieve a more sophisticated and secure validation code for the postal franking systems to be printed on postage mail.

As for claim 8, Windel, Gilham, and Eckert disclose, all the limitations of claim 2, further;

What Windel, Gilham, Guenther, and Eckert are not specific and explicit about is a processor programmed by said first memory to calculate said data authorization code using an algorithm selected from the group consisting of DES algorithms and triplet DES algorithms. However, Cordery clearly teaches the application of "triple DES" algorithm (See Cordery figure 3, col. 8, ln. 14-20 and ln. 50-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to combine the above teachings to achieve further strength in the cryptography of the validation code to be printed by the postal franking systems to be printed on postage mail.

Art Unit: 3621

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 4,725,718, to Ronald, P. Sansone, Postage and Mailing Information Applying System.

U.S. Patent No. 5,177,687, to Brad A. Baggary, Insertion Machine With Postage Categorization and Selective Merchandising.

E.P. Patent No. EP 862,143 A2, to Haral Windel, Method and Arrangement for generating and Chenking a Security Imprint.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Abdi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3364. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231**

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

(703) 746-7749 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

**Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive
7th floor receptionist, Arlington, VA, 22202**

Abdi/K
August 21, 2002


**JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**